



Town of Arlington, MA Redevelopment Board

Agenda & Meeting Notice February 6, 2023

Per Board Rules and Regulations, public comments will be accepted during the public comment periods designated on the agenda. Written comments may be provided by email to cricker@town.arlington.ma.us by Monday, February 6, 2023 at 3:00 p.m. The Board requests that correspondence that includes visual information should be provided by Friday, February 3, 2023 at 12:00 p.m.

The Arlington Redevelopment Board will meet Monday, February 6, 2023 at 7:30 PM in the **Arlington Community Center, Main Hall, 27 Maple Street, Arlington, MA 02476**

1. Schedule, Outreach, and Engagement for 2023 Town Meeting Zoning Amendments

7:30 p.m. Board will review the hearing schedule for zoning amendments on the 2023 Annual Town Meeting warrant and discuss a plan for additional outreach and engagement on the Board's proposed amendments.

2. DPCD Administrative Approval

8:30 p.m. Staff will provide an overview of recent decisions that allowed for administrative review and approval, and will report on status of administrative review for those projects.

3. Business Districts, Lot Size, and FAR

9:00 p.m. Staff will provide an update on research into whether FAR for mixed-use and other development in the Business Districts is based on GFA or lot size.

4. Review Meeting Minutes

9:15 p.m. Board will review and vote to approve meeting minutes for 11/7/2022, 11/21/2022, 12/5/2022, and 12/19/2022.

5. Open Forum

9:30 p.m. Except in unusual circumstances, any matter presented for consideration of the Board shall neither be acted upon, nor a decision made the night of the presentation. There is a three minute time limit to present a concern or request.

6. New Business

9:40 p.m. New Business

7. Adjourn

9:45 p.m. Estimated



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Schedule, Outreach, and Engagement for 2023 Town Meeting Zoning Amendments

Summary:

7:30 p.m. Board will review the hearing schedule for zoning amendments on the 2023 Annual Town Meeting warrant and discuss a plan for additional outreach and engagement on the Board's proposed amendments.

ATTACHMENTS:

	Type	File Name	Description
▢	Reference Material	2023-02-02_Memo_Pre-ATM_Schedule_and_Engagement.pdf	Memo Pre-ATM Schedule and Engagement



TOWN OF ARLINGTON

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING and
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

TOWN HALL, 730 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE
ARLINGTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02476
TELEPHONE 781-316-3090

MEMORANDUM

To: Arlington Redevelopment Board
From: Claire Ricker, Director, Planning and Community Development
Kelly Lynema, Assistant Director, Planning and Community Development
Date: January 25, 2022
RE: Business Districts, Lot Size, and FAR

In January, 2023, the ARB filed 12 zoning amendments for Annual Town Meeting; an additional four citizen petitions for zoning amendments were received the following week, resulting in a total 16 zoning amendments that will be reviewed and voted on by the ARB during hearings in March. Staff propose to organize the zoning amendment hearings as follows (see Attachment A for complete list):

- 3/6: Industrial zoning amendments
- 3/13: Citizen petitions
- 3/20: Business district zoning amendments
- 3/27: Arlington Heights Business zoning district

During prior meetings, the ARB has discussed the need for additional outreach and engagement on several of the board's proposed amendments, specifically those designed to support existing commercial properties and encourage further growth in the Business Districts. To guide the ARB's discussion of warrant article hearings, outreach, and engagement for 2023 Annual Town Meeting, staff provide the following outline of key events, meetings, dates, and deadlines.

W/O	KEY DATES	EVENT	NOTES
1/23	1/27	Warrant closes	
2/6	2/6	ARB Meeting	Discuss hearing schedule for Annual Town Meeting zoning amendments, design outreach and engagement plan
	2/9	Legal ad to Advocate + Star	Ads due Friday before first date of publication
2/13	2/16	Legal notice #1	Ad #1 must be posted 14 days before first hearing
	2/13 - 2/16	Engagement opportunity / public meeting	

W/O	KEY DATES	EVENT	NOTES
2/20	2/23	Legal notice #2	February school vacation week
	2/20 - 2/24	Engagement opportunity / public meeting (limited due to school vacation)	
2/27	2/27	ARB Meeting	190-200 Mass Ave continued hearing
	2/27 - 3/2	Engagement opportunity / public meeting	
3/6	3/6	ARB Meeting: Hearing #1	99 Mass Ave continued hearing Industrial District zoning amendments
3/13	3/13	ARB Meeting: Hearing #2	Citizen petitions
3/20	3/20	ARB Meeting: Hearing #3	Business District zoning amendments
3/27	3/27	ARB Meeting: Hearing #4	AHB zoning amendments
4/3	4/3	ARB Meeting: Hearing #5	Deliberation on zoning amendments; vote
	4/4	Report preparation	Must be posted by 7:30pm for 4/6 agenda
	4/6	ARB Meeting: Report to Town Meeting	Revisions to and vote to approve Report to Town Meeting
	4/7	DPCD posts report	Available at arlingtonma.gov/ARB and arlingtonma.gov/TownMeeting
4/10	4/10 - 4/14	Education / engagement opportunity	
4/17	4/17	ARB Meeting	April school vacation week
	4/17 - 4/20	Engagement opportunity / public meeting (limited due to school vacation)	
4/24	4/24	Town Meeting Begins	ATM, nights 1 and 2
	4/25, 4/27	Engagement opportunity / public meeting (limited due to Town Meeting)	
5/1	5/1	ARB Meeting (6:30)	ATM, nights 3 and 4
5/8			ATM, nights 5 and 6
5/15	5/15	ARB Meeting (6:30)	ATM, nights 7 and 8
5/22			ATM, nights 9 and 10

While the March hearings are an opportunity for the community to weigh in on proposed amendments, staff would like to discuss with the Board potential outreach outside of the March hearings. Presently, the Town Calendar does not indicate any major conflicts with regard to the public meeting and outreach dates highlighted above. Options for discussion include:

- At least one virtual or in-person public information and listening session specifically on the six Business District amendments before the March hearings;
- An in-person meeting in Arlington Heights to engage residents about the proposed consolidation of the zoning districts in that neighborhood;
- Staff outreach through the Economic Development Coordinator and Chamber of Commerce to Arlington Heights business and business community at large;
- Town Meeting Members communication, both before March hearings and after the ARB issues final recommendations;
- Participation in precinct meetings, particularly in Arlington Heights precincts;
- A public information session (virtual or in-person, or at the Board's 4/17 meeting) about the ARB's final recommendation to Town Meeting; and
- Other ideas or suggestions as provided by the Board.

Attachment A: Zoning Amendment Hearing Schedule (proposed)

	FOCUS	REQ. BY	TITLE	HEARING DATE (PROPOSED)
A	Industrial	ARB	Industrial District Development Standards	3/6
B	Industrial	ARB	Solar Bylaw in Industrial Districts	
C	Industrial	ARB	ARB Jurisdiction over Industrial District	
D	Industrial	Anderson	Industrial District Animal Daycare Use	
E	Residential	Fleming	One- and Two-Family Usable Open Space	3/13
F	Business	Fleming	Downtown Business Parking Minimums	
G	Affordable Housing	Perkins	Build Affordable Housing Everywhere	
H	Business	ARB	Open Space in Business Districts	3/20
I	Business	ARB	Rear Yard Setbacks in Business Districts	
J	Business	ARB	Step Back Requirement in Business Districts	
K	Business	ARB	Reduced Height Buffer Area	
L	Business	ARB	Corner Lot Requirements	
M	Business	ARB	Height and Story Minimums in Business Districts	
N	AHB	ARB	Arlington Heights Business District	3/27
O	AHB	ARB	AHB Zoning Map Amendment	
P	Correction	ARB	Building Inspector, Enforcement	



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Business Districts, Lot Size, and FAR

Summary:

9:00 p.m. Staff will provide an update on research into whether FAR for mixed-use and other development in the Business Districts is based on GFA or lot size.

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
▢ Reference Material	Agenda_Item_3_Memo_Business_Districts_and_Lot_Size.pdf	Memo Business Districts and Lot Size



TOWN OF ARLINGTON

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING and
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

TOWN HALL, 730 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE
ARLINGTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02476
TELEPHONE 781-316-3090

MEMORANDUM

To: Arlington Redevelopment Board
From: Claire Ricker, Director, Planning and Community Development
Date: January 25, 2022
RE: Business Districts, Lot Size, and FAR

At the January 23, 2023 meeting of the Arlington Redevelopment Board (ARB), ARB members had discussed whether the FAR of mixed-use development in the B3 zoning district was determined based on the total square feet of a lot or the total square feet of development. Staff shared that FAR was based on total lot size, and offered to review prior versions of the Zoning Bylaw to provide background for this interpretation.

In 2017, the year after Town Meeting approved mixed-use in the Business Districts, the Zoning Bylaw clearly connects FAR and other dimensional regulations with the area of a lot (see highlighted areas below). This is consistent with prior years, in which "any other permitted use" for various Business Districts has rows for "-", "20,000", ">40,000", and ">80,000" square foot lot sizes based on the zoning district. There is no location in the Zoning Bylaw where mixed-use is linked to building size.

SECTION 6.00 - TABLE OF DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REGULATIONS (Continued)

ART. 8, STM 3/85; ART. 11, ATM 4/98	District	Use	Lot Requirements, Minimum ^M Size, Sq. Ft.	Frontage, Ft.	Intensity of Development Fl. Area Ratio Maximum	Lot Coverage Maximum Percent	Minimum Lot Area per Dwelling Unit, Sq. Ft.	Minimum Yard, Ft. ^P			Height Maximum		Open Space Minimum Percent of Gross Floor Area	
								Front ^E	Side ^E	Rear ^E	Stories	Feet ^Q	Landscaped	Usable
ART. 6, ATM 5/04	B3	Single-family detached dwelling, two-family dwelling, duplex house, three-family dwelling ^{RH}	6,000	60	0.75	NA	2,500	20	10	20	2-1/2	35	10%	30%
ART. 81, ATM 4/80		Building with a principal use of a town house structure or apartment house	20,000	100	1.40	NA	600	15+(H/10)(H+L)/6	(H+L)/6	(H+L)/6	5 3	60 40	10%	20%
ART. 6, ATM 4/16, ART. 6, ATM 4/17		Mixed Use	-	50	1.50	NA	NA	0	0	(H+L)/6	5 ^T	60		
			>20,000	50	1.40	NA	600	0	0	(H+L)/6	4 ^T 5 3	50 60 40	10%	J ^H
		Any other permitted use	-	50	1.00	NA	600	-	-	(H+L)/6	5 3	60 40	20%	-
			20,000	100	1.40	NA	600	-	-	(H+L)/6	5 3	60 40	10%	J ^H

It appears that when the Zoning Bylaw was recodified in 2018, square footage was added to the name of the use in the tables of dimensional and density regulations. As the purpose of recodification was to provide clarity and ease of use without introducing substantive changes to the Zoning Bylaw, staff

consider that the text for mixed-use noting “≤20,000 sq.ft.” and “>20,000 sq.ft.” refers to the lot size, as it did prior to recodification. There is admittedly an inconsistency between the language used for mixed-use and any other permitted use in the B3 and B5 zoning districts; staff will discuss with Town Counsel whether “on a lot” can be inserted administratively or whether a zoning amendment is necessary.

5-26 / DISTRICTS & USES

District Use	Minimum Requirement		
	Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot Area per Unit (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot Frontage (ft.)
Mixed-use	5,000	-----	50
Any other permitted use	5,000	2,500	50
B2			
Single-family detached dwelling, two-family dwelling, duplex dwelling, three-family dwelling	6,000	2,500	60
Townhouse or apartment building	5,000	1,450	50
Mixed-use ≤20,000 sq. ft.	-----	-----	50
Mixed-use >20,000 sq. ft.	>20,000	1,450	50
Any other permitted use	-----	1,450	50
B2A			
Single-family detached dwelling, two-family dwelling, duplex dwelling, three-family dwelling	6,000	2,500	60
Apartments on street w/ ROW ≤50 ft.	20,000	1,450	100
Apartments on street w/ ROW >50 ft.	20,000	700	100
Mixed-use ≤20,000 sq. ft.	-----	-----	50
Mixed-use >20,000 sq. ft.	>20,000	700	50
Any other permitted use	-----	-----	50
B3			
Single-family detached dwelling, two-family dwelling, duplex dwelling, three-family dwelling	6,000	2,500	60
Townhouse or apartment building	20,000	600	100
Mixed-use ≤20,000 sq. ft.	-----	-----	50
Mixed-use >20,000 sq. ft.	>20,000	600	50
Any other permitted use <20,000 sq. ft.	-----	600	50
Any other permitted use ≥20,000 sq. ft.	20,000	600	100
B4			
Single-family detached dwelling, two-family dwelling, duplex dwelling, three-family dwelling	6,000	2,500	60
Apartments on street w/ ROW ≤50 ft.	20,000	1,450	100
Apartments on street w/ ROW >50 ft.	20,000	700	100
Mixed-use ≤20,000 sq. ft.	-----	-----	50
Mixed-use >20,000 sq. ft.	>20,000	700	50
Any other permitted use	-----	-----	50
B5^A			
Single-family detached dwelling, two-family dwelling, duplex dwelling, three-family dwelling	6,000	2,500	60
Townhouse or apartment building	20,000	550	100
Mixed-use ≤20,000 sq. ft.	-----	-----	50
Mixed-use >20,000 sq. ft.	>20,000	700	50
Any other permitted use	-----	600	50
On a lot ≥ 40,000 sq. ft.	>40,000	550	100
On a lot ≥ 80,000 sq. ft.	>80,000	550	150



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Review Meeting Minutes

Summary:

9:15 p.m. Board will review and vote to approve meeting minutes for 11/7/2022, 11/21/2022, 12/5/2022, and 12/19/2022.

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
▢ Reference Material	11072022_Draft_Minutes_Redevelopment_Board.pdf	11072022 Draft Meeting Minutes
▢ Reference Material	11212022_Draft_Minutes_Redevelopment_Board.pdf	11212022 Draft Meeting Minutes
▢ Reference Material	12052022_Draft_Minutes_Redevelopment_Board.pdf	12052022 Draft Meeting Minutes
▢ Reference Material	12192022_Draft_Minutes_Redevelopment_Board.pdf	12192022 Draft Meeting Minutes

Arlington Redevelopment Board
Monday, November 7, 2022, at 7:30 PM
Community Center, Main Hall
27 Maple Street, Arlington, MA 02476
Meeting Minutes

This meeting was recorded by ACMI.

PRESENT: Rachel Zsembery (Chair), Eugene Benson, Kin Lau, Melisa Tintocalis, Steve Revilak

STAFF: Claire Ricker, Director of Planning and Community Development, and Kelly Lynema, Assistant Director

The Chair called the meeting to order and introduced agenda item 1, docket #3722, application by Leader Bank to replace a wall sign at 141 Mass Ave.

Ms. Ricker stated that the applicant is seeking to replace the existing signage with a wall sign that exceeds what is allowed by right in the property's sign district—the Residential/Business Sign District—but complies with what is allowed in the adjacent Business Sign District.

The Chair gave the floor to the applicant. Lawrin Rosen of ARTfx signage gave a presentation on behalf of Leader Bank. He stated they met 18 of 19 criteria.

The Chair gave the floor to the Board. Mr. Lau asked about the panel materials; Mr. Rosen replied an aluminum/plastic composite. Mr. Lau stated that in return for relief on the size, he would request that the sign be extended so it looks like part of the building façade.

Ms. Tintocalis asked staff for guidance on pedestrian signs. Ms. Lynema confirmed that two signs are allowed; the Chair nodded yes. Ms. Tintocalis asked the applicant why pedestrian signage was not addressed in the proposal. The applicant replied that the front sign would have to be reduced to accommodate the total square footage requirement.

Mr. Benson stated that sign is about 39 square feet, but the sign bylaw limits the size to 20 square feet. He asked the applicant why they couldn't install a 20-square-foot sign. Mr. Rosen stated they had tried different sizes, and the larger was in perfect ratio. Discussion followed.

Ms. Tintocalis approved the recommendation to extend the white band on the sign, and requested further input from the Board regarding the pedestrian signs. Mr. Lau stated that the bank should not be punished because the zoning is mixed up, and voiced his approval of the proposal. The Chair supported the Board approving the larger sign as is.

Mr. Revilak addressed two other requirements that the applicant doesn't meet: in the Residential/Business sign district, in addition to a 20-square-foot maximum area, there is also a sign height limit of six feet. He also asked for the width of the white panel and of the sign. He stated that one of the other restrictions is that the sign is limited to 60 percent of the width of the architectural element, and the applicant may be exceeding that. Discussion followed.

The Chair stated that she has no issue with approving the signage as if it was in the Business Sign District rather than the Residential Business Sign District. She stated that her biggest concern is with the 60 percent limit, and suggested extending the white band across the width.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment. A female resident offered spacing suggestions.

Absent further public comment, the Chair gave the floor to the Board. Mr. Revilak supported the Chair's extension solution to the 60 percent constraint.

Mr. Benson disagreed, stating that stretching out the white band is aesthetically wrong, and suggested reducing the star in the sign to 20 feet.

Ms. Tintocalis approved of the recommendation to extend continuity. She asked for input from the Board regarding blade signs.

Mr. Lau approved of extending the white band. He also stated that the applicant should not be punished for the inconsistent zoning on Mass Ave.

The Chair requested that the applicant reduce the number of window signs to one.

Discussion followed.

The Chair called for a motion to approve the signage with the size as proposed, with the condition that the white band be extended and that one of the two window signs be removed. Mr. Lau so moved; Mr. Revilak seconded. The Board voted 4-1 in favor; Mr. Benson voted no.

The Chair introduced agenda item 2, docket #3723, special permit application by 22-24 Belknap Street to renovate and construct a large addition to an existing two-family residence in the R2 district.

Ms. Ricker stated that the building will change from a stacked to a side-by-side two-family, and that the Board has jurisdiction because the property abuts the Minuteman Bikeway. She advised the Chair that this was a simple special permit approval, with no relief being requested.

James Rissling of LR Designs presented the applicant's proposal. Discussion followed.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment. Deb Bermudes reported concerns about possible violations caused by massing that increases with the effort to maximize square footage.

Chris Loreti objected to two side-by-side driveways.

Absent further public comment, the Chair returned the floor to the Board to discuss driveways, buffers, and fencing. She also recommended that the owner work with staff to identify sustainability measures.

Ms. Tintocalis proposed administratively following up on the LEED checklist.

Mr. Benson objected, stating that this should come back to the Board to prevent a precedent where applicants do not file checklists.

Mr. Revilak suggested that the permit not be delayed by the LEED checklist in this case. The Chair agreed.

The Chair called for a motion to approve the project as submitted. Mr. Lau so moved; Ms. Tintocalis seconded. The Board voted 4-1 in favor; Mr. Benson voted no.

The Chair introduced agenda item 3, docket #3717, proposal to construct a mixed-use building containing retail and commercial space and residential units at 80 Broadway, in the B4 District.

Ms. Ricker stated that the applicant proposes to replace an existing single-story commercial building with a five-story mixed-use building, adding more than 1,000 feet to the total commercial area, as well as nine residential units to the upper floors, which will trigger inclusionary zoning. The mixed-use structure is in compliance with the Master Plan.

The architect gave a slide presentation.

The Chair gave the floor to the Board. Mr. Lau suggested adding a deck for open space, and approved of the proposal. Discussion followed. Ms. Tintocalis also approved. Discussion of setbacks followed. Mr. Benson approved as well, and asked about residential elevator access; the applicant stated a key fob would be provided. Mr. Benson requested to see the shadow studies. He also stated that the applicant is asking for half of the required bicycle parking, and that the top deck does not qualify as open space. He also requested further details on the units. He questioned whether the residential gross floor might be undercounted, and asked whether the applicant counted not only the interior size of the apartments, but also hallways, stairwells, elevators, et cetera. Mr. Benson requested that applicant provide a better understanding of the actual gross floor area.

Mr. Revilak asked whether the open space was calculated as a percentage of 6,770 square feet, which is the lot size; this should be corrected to reflect a percentage of the residential gross floor area. The applicant stated that his calculations were based on the residential area, 7,243 square feet. Discussion followed, on aesthetics.

Absent further comments from the Board, the Chair opened the floor for public comment. Terry Chu stated her concern that a five-story building would reduce sunlight. Mr. Benson replied that this is the reason he asked for a shadow study. Mr. Lau stated that trees are already casting comparable shadows in summer; Ms. Chu stated it is inaccurate to compare the tree and building shadows, and is concerned about the amount of sunlight that might be blocked.

Matthew Malone spoke in support of the project; he also stated the current shadow studies were not accurate.

Chris Loreti spoke against the proposal, stating it is out of character with its surroundings and citing some legal cases. The Chair advised him that his understanding of the Board's ability to work together with developers is beyond what he had stated.

Absent further public comment, the Chair stated that she did not think the Board was ready to vote on this project and read her list of issues needing resolution. The Chair called for a motion to continue to December 19. Mr. Benson so moved; Ms. Tintocalis seconded. The Board voted unanimously to continue.

The Chair introduced agenda item 4, modifications to the ARB rules and regulations. The Chair called for a motion to approve the modifications as submitted. Absent public comment, the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair introduced agenda item 5, the hybrid meeting protocol. She suggested the Board defer this to their 11/21 meeting.

The Chair introduced agenda item 6, creation of an MBTA Communities Working Group for zoning recommendations to achieve compliance with Section 3A, MBTA Communities.

Ms. Ricker gave an overview and requested that the Board vote to establish the working group that evening. Mr. Lau stated his interest in joining the group, barring Board opposition. He was eventually joined by Mr. Revilak. The Chair called for a motion to approve the recommended composition of the group; the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair introduced agenda item 7, open forum. Matthew Malone requested a Town Meeting discussion of open space requirements for mixed-use development. The Chair replied that this is first on the Board's list of potential zoning bylaw modifications for this year.

The Chair introduced agenda item 8, new business. Mr. Lau stated his intention to prevent slanderous accusations of conflict of interest from going forward. The Chair concurred. Mr. Revilak stated that the brewery slated for 464 Massachusetts Avenue had decided to take another space.

Absent other new business, the Chair called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lau so moved; Ms. Tintocalis seconded. The Board voted unanimously in favor.

Meeting adjourned.

DRAFT

Arlington Redevelopment Board
Monday, November 21, 2022, at 7:30 PM
Community Center, Main Hall
27 Maple Street, Arlington, MA 02476
Meeting Minutes

This meeting was recorded by ACMI.

PRESENT: Rachel Zsembery (Chair), Eugene Benson, Kin Lau, Steve Revilak

STAFF: Claire Ricker, Director of Planning and Community Development, and Kelly Lynema, Assistant Director

The Chair called the meeting to order and notified all attending that the meeting is being recorded by ACMI.

The Chair opened agenda item 1, Docket #3724, application by Batten Bros. Signs for Arlington Center Garage and Service Corp, 438 Massachusetts Avenue. The applicant proposes to replace the existing wall signs and a directory sign at Beth Israel Lahey Health, 37 Broadway, Arlington, MA in the Major Business Zoning and Business Sign districts. The opening of the special permit is to allow the Board to review and approve the project under Section 6.2, Signs.

Claire Ricker stated that the applicant is looking to change out the signage and have a comprehensive special permit issued for the remainder of the signage. The Chair asked, of the existing signs, which is the non-permitted sign; Kelly Lynema replied, the directory sign.

The Chair gave the floor to the proponent, Jeff Sara of Batten Bros. Signs, who requested a permit for a freestanding sign.

The Chair gave the floor to the Board. Mr. Lau stated that the applicant is asking for relief for the height of the freestanding sign. Ms. Lynema stated that the total sign area is more than is allowed for wall signs, and that relief for the freestanding sign is not allowed. Mr. Lau stated the Board could give relief on everything but the freestanding sign, which he would like to see removed. Mr. Benson agreed with Mr. Lau. Mr. Revilak asked that the wall sign facing Silk Street be centered, and agreed with Mr. Lau and Mr. Benson.

Mr. Sara stated that he was not authorized to get rid of the freestanding sign, but would inform the landlord. Mr. Lau advised that if the landlord is willing to remove it, the approval process can be done administratively.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment. Seeing none, she closed public comment and returned the floor to the Board. Mr. Benson and Mr. Revilak both agreed with Mr. Lau.

Ms. Lynema suggested a directory sign that's attached to a wall of the building as a suitable replacement for the freestanding sign.

The Chair requested a motion to approve the signs as submitted with the provision that the applicant work together with the building landlord for the removal of the freestanding directory sign. Mr. Lau so moved; Mr. Benson seconded. The Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to agenda item 2, preliminary discussion of zoning amendments that will inform the process for the 2023 Annual Town Meeting, the first proposed article being related to open space requirements for multifamily and mixed use.

Laura Wiener stated that, regarding commercial zones, the town's bylaw paradoxically requires more open space be provided with each unit built and each additional floor. Per 5.3.21D, the open space requirement is 30% of the residential floor area; the bylaw allows four and five stories for mixed use and 3.0 FAR, but that cannot be built. Ms. Wiener wished to initiate a discussion as to how to deal with the impractical open space requirement.

The Chair gave the floor to the Board. Mr. Lau stated that he supports eliminating open space requirement in the business district, encouraging more business and pedestrian street activity. Mr. Benson agreed with Mr. Lau regarding commercial building, but for residential and mixed use, suggested a 10% landscape based on the size of the lot, rather than the square footage of the building. Discussion followed.

The Chair asked whether this should continue as a resident petition or if it might be sponsored by the Board. Mr. Lau suggested that the Board lead, because it gives them the opportunity to do more outreach. Mr. Benson stated he was satisfied with either approach but inclines toward the Board leading. The Chair stated she would like to work toward crafting an article.

The Chair moved to the next item, proposal for parking minimum elimination in the B5 district.

James Fleming presented the proposal. Mr. Lau stated that this might be another way of unlocking potential in the downtown area and reducing pollution. Mr. Benson stated he favored this for a commercial building, but not for residential.

The Chair agreed with Mr. Benson and stated that the town has the ability to reduce the parking down to zero for commercial already. Mr. Revilak agreed as well. The Chair stated that the Board would likely support reducing parking minimums, but that should be in concert with plans for residential parking. Discussion followed. The Chair asked how the Board would feel about waiving the residential requirement down to zero, with a transportation demand management plan. Discussion followed.

The Chair moved to the next article, elimination of usable open space requirements.

Mr. Fleming stated that a large part of the town is out of conformance with open space, which should not be required for single- and two-family uses. The consensus was that the point of the open-space requirements is not clear. Ms. Lynema stated that the zoning bylaws contain redundant restrictions, and the challenge is to demonstrate that setback requirements can achieve the spirit of the open space requirements.

The Chair moved to the last of four articles, affordable housing on non-conforming parcels.

Barbara Thornton presented her proposal and requested assistance from the Board. Mr. Benson asked Ms. Thornton to clarify "non-conforming." She stated it refers to lots that have extra vacant land that is not big enough to use, which a developer could use in lieu of open space requirements. Discussion followed.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment. Steve Moore stated his objection to Mr. Fleming's idea that only property owners have the best idea for how to develop the property, at the expense of the community. He stated that there is a need for a balanced approach. Discussion followed.

Barbara Thornton proposed renting driveway spaces for overnight parking. Discussion followed.

The Chair moved to agenda item 3, the hybrid meeting protocol, to pilot hybrid meeting technology for future, larger-scale deployment, and to provide feedback on the use of both the hybrid technology as well as the ease of running and participating in a hybrid meeting.

Ms. Lynema stated this would require additional staff or volunteers, and it would take time to fine-tune it and make sure that we can have equitable participation from those in the room and those who are participating remotely. She mentioned acoustical problems with the current location.

The Chair gave the floor to the Board. Mr. Lau stated that this would put an undue burden on the Board, and that the current meeting location is inadequate for the purpose; he requested to delay. Mr. Benson mentioned a possible state

memo that would impose a March deadline on hybrid meetings; the Chair stated that March is not the deadline for hybrid meetings. Discussion followed regarding technical challenges; Mr. Revilak suggested the webinar format; The Chair stated she would request an additional license.

The Chair moved to agenda item 4, meeting minutes, and requested a motion to approve the October 3 and October 17, 2022, meeting minutes as amended. For both sessions, Mr. Lau so moved; Mr. Benson seconded; the Board unanimously approved.

The Chair moved to agenda item 5, open forum.

Ms. Thornton asked about the change in the meeting format, and stated that during COVID, she saw a greater percentage of younger people and women attending. The Chair replied that part of the pilot program would be keeping track of who is attending in person and who is attending remotely.

Mary Ellen Aronow stated that her town committee had done two hybrid meetings, which went very well, and the technology was not "scary."

The Chair moved to agenda item 6, new business.

Ms. Lynema stated that the first public meeting on MBTA communities was held on November 17, 2022; information regarding that meeting is now posted to the town website. She also reported interest in the working group. Mr. Benson mentioned that the T has removed or reduced some bus routes, and the town lost out in the process.

Mr. Revilak stated that the multifamily zoning presentation was very successful. He also stated that the Winchester Special Town Meeting had adopted an ADU bylaw.

The Chair requested a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lau so moved; Mr. Benson seconded. The Board voted unanimously in favor.

Meeting adjourned.

Arlington Redevelopment Board
Monday, December 5, 2022, at 7:30 PM
Community Center, Main Hall
27 Maple Street, Arlington, MA 02476
Meeting Minutes

This meeting was recorded by ACMi.

PRESENT: Rachel Zsembery (Chair), Eugene Benson, Kin Lau, Melisa Tintocalis, Steve Revilak

STAFF: Claire Ricker, Director of Planning and Community Development, and Kelly Lynema, Assistant Director

The Chair opened with agenda item 1, Docket #3728, 99 Massachusetts Avenue, proposal to convert an existing office building to mixed-use by converting the attic to residential in the B2 District.

Ms. Ricker stated that the applicant seeks additional signage for the facade. There would be no net loss of commercial space, which will be renovated, with additional ADA access provided to the below-grade commercial space. The applicant has provided additional locations for bicycle parking, as well as the LEED checklist.

The Chair gave the floor to the applicant.

James Rissling of LR Designs requested relief to build an additional floor for the dwelling unit.

The Chair gave the floor to the Board. Mr. Lau stated that he is generally supportive of the project but will confirm whether an elevator is required for the fourth-story addition. He stated that the design doesn't look balanced, and made some aesthetic suggestions.

Mr. Benson also objected to the design, and asked about drainage and setbacks. He asked where the property line is, because the parking might overlap. He questioned the placement of the bike locker, and requested a shadow study. Discussion followed.

The applicant assured Ms. Tintocalis that the current tenants would not be disturbed by the construction, and that signage text was still pending. The applicant confirmed that the unit would be a rental.

Mr. Revilak asked whether the applicant would reduce the parking spaces to five. The applicant agreed, if it brought them closer to being able to do the project.

Mr. Benson clarified to Mr. Revilak that the project is not in the mixed-use district, but in B2. Ms. Lynema clarified that there are not any R1, R2, or OS properties abutting the property. Mr. Revilak asked if a canopy or doorway sign would be considered, for visibility; and he agreed that the upper story should blend more with the rest of the building. The Chair stated her aesthetic concerns.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment. James Fleming asked about setback requirements, and stated the Board could accomplish its review with an email. The Chair stated that the Board must address the items in the checklist. She stated that the setback is required to ensure that there is a break in the vertical articulation of a facade.

Chris Loreti questioned the applicant's statement that the only relief they were seeking is for the special permit itself, given that they are not meeting other requirements.

The Chair gave the floor to the Board. Mr. Revilak questioned the need for a setback on one side, which he sees as abutting an alley.

Mr. Benson stated the area is not an alley, but a short, narrow street.

Mr. Lau proposed moving to extend to a future meeting.

Mr. Benson stated he could not vote because of his interpretation of the setback. The Chair replied that the setback should be from the lot line, not the building, but other interpretations could be considered, especially for non-conforming lots. Mr. Benson asked the Chair whether other board members are opposed to applying the setback from the property line; the other four members indicated they were in favor of using the property line as the point of measurement.

The Chair requested a motion to continue the hearing to Monday, January 23, 2023 with a request for the following:

- Changing the location of the building sign
- Adjusting the scale of the cornice
- Changing the window pattern on the side of the building
- Adding the dimensions of parking spaces
- Reducing the size of the parapet on the top floor
- Using an electric heat source
- Looking at installing a level 2 EV charger
- Providing a shadow study
- Clarifying the cladding to be used
- Changing the hexagonal window above the entry
- Attempting to provide 122 square feet of additional landscaped open space

Mr. Lau so moved; Mr. Benson seconded. The Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair then moved to a discussion of zoning amendments for 2023 Town Meeting. Staff presented a member discussing the zoning amendments that the board has expressed interest in over previous months.

Ms. Ricker explained that very little of Arlington's zoned land is in the Business Districts. The dimensional requirements of the zoning bylaw work in tandem to restrict the amount of ground floor space that can function as commercial property when a lot is redeveloped. The Board has indicated interest in adjusting these dimensional requirements to support economic development and increasing the commercial tax base.

Mr. Benson stated overall agreement with staff's suggestions in the memorandum. He is undecided on whether the Board should accept payments in lieu of open space, and thinks it may be beneficial to add exemptions for pre-existing nonconforming lots.

Ms. Tintocalis stated she is leaning toward payment in lieu of open space.

The Chair continued discussion of setbacks and height minimums in the business district. Ms. Ricker suggested a minimum building height in the business districts of 25 feet.

Mr. Revilak agreed, suggesting a process for exemptions in the public interest or the height is not possible.

Mr. Lau asked whether the public will be involved in crafting the final main motions. The Chair stated yes; at the moment, the Board was determining warrant articles to be filed.

Mr. Lau did not support payment in lieu.

Discussion followed regarding setbacks.

The Chair moved to the next item, the Arlington Heights business district. Ms. Ricker stated that the memo outlines recommendations from the 2019 Arlington Heights Neighborhood Action Plan that would consolidate multiple business

districts in the Heights into one business district. Mr. Lau stated that the sidewalks and the parking in the Heights are too tight to encourage lively active streets and businesses. Discussion followed. Ms. Tintocalis asked if pervious material for asphalt might be available for the new zoning district. Mr. Revilak stated that they might be continuing an undesirable nonconformity, and this should be reviewed.

The Chair moved to industrial uses clarifications. Discussion followed regarding microbreweries, storage units, and storm drains.

The Chair moved to agenda item 3, open forum.

James Fleming asked about open space requirements, and about multiple businesses offering the same or similar services.

The Chair moved to new business. Ms. Ricker stated they have hired a new Economic Development Coordinator and have promoted Ms. Muszynski, former Office Manager, to CDBG Administrator. They will be hiring a new Office Manager and a Senior Transportation Planner.

Mr. Benson stated that Inspectional Services is not enforcing the sign bylaw because they are understaffed and have more important issues. The Chair stated that Mike Ciampa was working to restart some of those efforts. Mr. Revilak suggested the Board meet the new economic development coordinator and maybe the Chamber of Commerce, date to be determined.

The Chair requested a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lau so moved; Ms. Tintocalis seconded. The Board voted unanimously in favor.

Meeting adjourned

Arlington Redevelopment Board
Monday, December 19, 2022, at 7:30 PM
Community Center, Main Hall
27 Maple Street, Arlington, MA 02476
Meeting Minutes

This meeting was recorded by ACMi.

PRESENT: Rachel Zsembery (Chair), Eugene Benson, Kin Lau, Melisa Tintocalis, Steve Revilak

STAFF: Claire Ricker, Director of Planning and Community Development, and Kelly Lynema, Assistant Director

The Chair introduced agenda item 1, Docket # 3729, proposal by Tatte Bakery to open a restaurant of greater than 3,000 square feet and install signage at 645 Massachusetts Avenue, in the B5 Business District.

Ms. Ricker stated that the applicant is requesting relief for parking and is willing to provide additional parking areas, e.g., bicycles, and is looking to update the existing façade, including seeking relief related to signage.

The applicant's attorney Robert Annese stated that the site has been a good choice for restaurants since the 1960s. The applicant would provide parking in the back, but indoor bicycle parking is not allowed for health reasons, and they would be willing to discuss designated bike parking with the town. The facility would contain 131 seats, with outdoor patio use as well. Mr. Annese stressed that the property has been vacant for a substantial period, and the owner needs a tenant. With regard to relief for car and bicycle parking, Mr. Annese requested that the Board take into consideration favorable letters from residents.

Brendan Boyle, Tatte's VP of Development described the proposed eatery as an "elegant comfort food model." The applicant's architect presented a slide show of the proposed façade, floor plan, and signage.

The Chair stated that there are too many signs on the in the building, but would be willing to give relief to allow for the signage over each of the individual entrances. She requested that they eliminate the middle awning sign and only have one awning sign and one wall-mounted sign. The Chair stated there was no LEED checklist, which is required.

Mr. Lau expressed his approval of relief on the signage and parking. He suggested more consistency in the window design, and asked about the mechanical equipment on the roof; the applicant stated that they are reutilizing the existing system, which is on the exterior of the building. Mr. Lau asked about outdoor seating; the Chair stated that this is a matter for the Select Board. Discussion followed.

Mr. Benson asked for clarification on possible discrepancies in the application form. Regarding sidewalk bicycle parking, the Chair stated that the town would need to approve this. Discussion of ventilation/air filtration, and signage followed. Mr. Benson requested a transportation demand management plan (TDM).

Ms. Tintocalis approved of the project, and stated she supports the allowance needed for parking and signage. She proposed the addition of a blade sign. She suggested the Board could consider a motion that the Redevelopment Board would show its support for outdoor seating. Discussion followed regarding parking and sidewalks.

Mr. Revilak stated his approval of the project. He asked if the applicant is planning to propose a TDM plan. Mr. Annese stated that he did not have an answer yet.

The Chair stated for the record that they did receive letters of support from the public, and opened the floor for public comment. Seeing none, she returned the floor to the Board. The Chair then reviewed four items that have been requested for clarification: first, a LEED ID+C checklist related to interior design and construction; second, clarifying the square footages on the application; third, create a TDM plan; and fourth, to consider adding grills to the existing non-divided windows.

Mr. Lau requested a motion to approve, with the applicant working with the Department of Planning and Community Development (DPCD) for administrative approval. Mr. Benson agreed, but stated the need to review the LEED checklist. Ms. Tintocalis favored administrative approval. Mr. Revilak agreed, and the Chair agreed with Mr. Lau's suggestion as well.

The Chair requested a motion to approve upon completion of the LEED checklist and submitting a TDM plan for review and approval by the DPCD; a reduction of the wall signs on the Mass Ave façade to one adjacent to each entry; elimination of the center awning sign; and ensuring that the quantity of short-term bicycle parking spaces available are equal to the sum of the long- and short-term parking. Mr. Lau so moved; Ms. Tintocalis seconded. The Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair introduced agenda item 2, Docket #3730, 185 Massachusetts Avenue, proposal to change the use of the property to a fast-order food restaurant, The Fat Greek, and install a wall sign.

Ms. Ricker stated that the applicant's proposed use of signage is allowed by right in this district, and they are also asking for a reduction to the vehicle parking requirements and can provide some bike parking.

Attorney Robert Annese stated that historically, vehicle parking is a problem at the location, and bringing a bicycle into a confined restaurant kitchen is a public health concern. In order to succeed, the applicant needs relief for vehicle and bike parking.

A member of the applicant team described the menu -- Greek street food -- as well as seating, cooking facilities, and signage.

The Chair gave the floor to the Board. Mr. Lau stated he approved of parking relief. He also requested sidewalk/pedestrian lighting and suggested planters on the sidewalk. He requested that grease hoods be centralized and discussed trash disposal and stated that grease storage cannot narrow the hallway. Mr. Annese stated that the situation has been in place for years, and nothing would change.

The Chair stated a TDM plan is required.

Mr. Benson suggested the applicant make arrangements with the town regarding bike racks out front. He also expressed some concern about food/cooking odors.

Ms. Tintocalis stated she supports the allowance on the parking and requested proper controls on air filters for the odors, which are expected in a restaurant. She requested facade design improvements.

Mr. Revilak approved of the menu and acknowledged that Capitol Square parking is a challenge. He requested that the applicant pursue the possibility of having a bike rack installed in front.

Mr. Lau clarified that the exhaust on the roof should be set as far away from the back as possible and aimed toward Mass Ave. The Chair stated that some of the placement recommendations are appropriate, but the Board has not required it of others in the past.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment. George Kougeas stated that cooking odor is not a problem. Cheryl Marcel disagreed, and requested that no special permit be granted unless fully effective pollution control be installed and maintained. John Leone suggested requiring charcoal filters for the odor; trash pickups during business hours only; and diligent rodent control. Suzanne Leone Linder complained about the same issues, as did John Linder.

The Chair asked the applicant to address these concerns. The applicant agreed. Mr. Annese stated that the restaurant is allowed in the B3 zone, and this application is not an aberration.

The Chair summarized the requests from the Board: a TDM plan; parking relief; frosted front window with no graphics; limitations on times for trash pickup; filtration and exhaust. The Chair suggested the applicant work with the landlord and the other tenants to identify a possible screened containment area for the trash.

Mr. Lau stated that the property has no area for screened trash and suggested possible on-demand drop-off, which might also mitigate the rodent problem. He is not sure how effective charcoal filters would be; he also requested that the applicant look to increase the lighting at the front. Mr. Benson suggested adding trash pickup to the special permit. Discussion followed.

The Chair requested a motion to approve with the following conditions:

- on-demand trash pickup and delivery no earlier than 7 a.m.;
- enhanced filtration and orienting the exhaust towards Mass Ave, to be reviewed administratively;
- a TDM plan, to be reviewed administratively;
- lighting for the entry underneath the soffit.

Mr. Lau so moved; Ms. Tintocalis seconded. The Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair introduced Docket #3717, continuance of proposal to construct a mixed-use building containing retail and commercial space and four residential units at 80 Broadway.

Ms. Ricker stated that the applicant has provided the Board with the materials requested, including shadow studies; the checklist; TDM plan; and additional design for long-term bike parking. The applicant's architect presented the updated materials.

The Chair gave the floor to the Board.

Mr. Lau requested that welder lights replace wall packs in the parking area.

Regarding the TDM plan, Mr. Benson stated that the Board would not allow commercial tenants to use residential parking spaces; the plan did not say how the applicant would allocate parking; and the reduced parking space size would require a waiver. Mr. Benson and the architect discussed the shadow study.

Ms. Tintocalis approved of the revisions.

Mr. Revilak requested the use of native plants for landscaping and suggested putting windows on the stairwell walls. He asked if the applicant would consider unbundling parking spaces from the rent; the applicant stated no unit automatically has parking. He asked how the applicant would make the case that an additional story would not adversely affect adjacent districts. The architect replied that it doesn't look like a full story from the street.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment.

Ben Beckwith stated that the building would violate a number of zoning bylaws. Salpie Tokadjian stated her concerns that the shadows will be cast across the street. Terry Chu stated that a five-story building would interfere with sunlight. Bob Radochia asked what the height is to the top of the penthouse, what the zoning requirement is in the district; he asked about snow removal. The Chair stated that the owner would have to deal with this.

Chris Loreti listed deficiencies in the application.

The Chair gave the floor to the Board.

Mr. Revilak stated his concerns about adverse effects; Mr. Benson stated that the height of the building is allowed under the zoning, but based on the shadow studies, there's not enough adverse impact to deny this development because it meets all of the other criteria. He requested a better TDM.

Mr. Lau stated his support for the project and made parking recommendations, which could be done administratively.

The Chair stated that the TDM plan would also be eligible for administrative approval. She recapped the request for adjustments to the project:

- removing the wall packs on the facade of the building that faces the neighbors and replacing those with bollards that are facing back towards the building;
- allocating six spaces to tenants and adjusting the TDM plan to be very specific about how those are allocated;
- adding an EV charging station;
- updating the planting schedule to use native plant species;
- adding windows on the south side;
- separate signage review and approval;
- adjusting parking to make two 16-foot compact spaces.

The Chair suggested lighting options be under administrative review after ensuring that there is no light spill.

The Chair asked Mr. Benson to restate the findings, which will be part of the motion:

- the applicant will not adversely affect the existing topographic conditions;
- the building meets setback requirements;
- the landscape and open space is acceptable;
- the parking requirements will be reduced.

The Chair requested a motion to approve the project as revised, with the following changes:

- an updated TDM plan, including the allocation of parking spaces for the residents;
- an EV charging station;
- a revised planting schedule, using native plants;
- a separate review for tenant signage;

Mr. Lau reminded the Chair about selection of affordable units.

The Chair requested a motion to approve; Mr. Lau so moved; Ms. Tintocalis seconded. The Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair introduced agenda item 4, open forum. Absent public comment, the Chair closed open forum and opened agenda item 5, new business. Ms. Ricker stated that 10 Sunnyside has been approved by the state for 40B.

Absent further new business, The Chair requested a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lau so moved; Ms. Tintocalis seconded. The Board voted unanimously to adjourn.